



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,632	05/01/2001	Andrew D. Dubner	56650US002	4391
32692	7590	07/01/2004		
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427				
			EXAMINER FRIDIE JR, WILLMON	
			ART UNIT 3722	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,632

Applicant(s)

DUBNER ET AL.

Examiner

Willmon Fridie, Jr.

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/8/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stephens .

Stephens discloses all of the subject matter as set forth in the claims and is identical to the invention as broadly recited. Some of the claimed elements clearly disclosed by the reference are: a security feature (16), a transparent fragile layer(12') and a transparent durable layer (12"). Further Stephens inherently teaches the method in claims 23 and 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3722

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 9,12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens .

Stephens discloses the claimed invention except for claimed layer materials. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any suitable material, since it has been held to be within the general skill level of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

6. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens in view of Killey.

Stephens discloses the claimed invention except for a holographic foil layer. Killey teaches that it is well known in the art to use a holographic foil layer in its assembly. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Stephens with a holographic foil layer in the manner as taught by Killey in order to enhance the security feature.

Art Unit: 3722

7. Claims 4,6,7,8,10,11,14-16,19,20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens in view McConville et al..

Stephens discloses the claimed invention except for a retroreflective layer of glass beads. McConville et al teaches that it is well known in the art to use a a retroreflective layer of glass beads (24), hot melt adhesive (32) ,a protective coating laquer coating and an index coating (26) in his assembly. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Stephens with a retroreflective layer of glass beads beads (24), hot melt adhesive (32) ,a protective coating laquer coating and an index coating (26) in the manner as taught by McConville et al in order to enhance and protect the security feature.

McConville et al further teaches that it is well known to use a composite assembly of the claimed elements in a document of value (see column 1, lines 25-65).

8. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens in view of McConville and Killey.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to provide Stephens with a multi-layer optical film layer and a holographic foil layer in the manner as taught by McConville and Killey for the reasons stated in the previous paragraphs.

Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are very broadly presented (i.e., fragile layer, durable layer , security element etc,) and

Art Unit: 3722

are not positively recited with significant structure in the rejected claim(s) to distinguish over the prior art. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

In regard to applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23 and 24, once again the features upon which applicant relies are very broadly presented (i.e., fragile layer, durable layer, security element etc,) and are not positively recited. It is clear from Stephens disclosure that the method recited by applicant is substantially similar to the assembly steps of the Stephens device. Applicant's attention is directed to column 2, lines 1-23.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3722

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office actions directly into the Group...**Official-(703)872-9302...After Final-(703) 872 9303**. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3700 will be promptly forward to the examiner.

Any inquiries concerning issues other than the substantive content of this and previous communications, such as missing references or filed papers not acknowledged, should be directed to the Customer Service Representative, Tech Center 3700, (703) 306-5648.


Art Unit: 3722

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W. Fridie, Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 308-1866.

wf

June 28, 2004



**WILLMON FRIDIE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER**